

he  
A  
B  
O  
L  
I  
T  
I  
O  
N  
I  
S  
T

THE DEATH OF A MYTH  
by Ken Brown

The political trial of the Chicago Seven is just one more example of good old Amerikan repression. However, it may at last have awakened many people to the truth about "the right to dissent" in Amerika. At long last the carefully protected myth which says that individuals have the right to disagree with the majority may finally have been shattered.

This myth has managed to remain through some of the most blatant cases of repression. The history of Amerika is scattered with numerous examples of the intolerance of minority positions. To cite just a few examples, the Haymarket Riot case and the Sacco-Vanzetti trial were both cases of the same kind of repression of the unorthodox and the radical by the Establishment.

Both cases bear striking similarities to the Chicago Seven case. In each, a group of radicals were labeled as "anarchists" and "dangerous men" in much the same way that the Chicago Seven have been labeled. And in each case, the defendants were convicted not on the basis of any evidence, but solely because of their radical beliefs. In fact, Sacco and Vanzetti may have had a judge who rivaled Julius Hoffman in his hostility to the defendants. He constantly referred to the two of them as "those anarchist bastards."

The Chicago Seven have fared better than the defendants in the other two cases, since most of them were executed. Perhaps they were lucky that the kops didn't kill anyone in the streets of Chicago during their riot. For the Seven would certainly have been blamed for the deaths, and could have followed in the footsteps of the Haymarket victims and Sacco and Vanzetti.

How has this myth about Amerikan tolerance been maintained through all of these bloody acts of repression? It wasn't easy! After each of these cases there was great public outrage---for several days. However, each of these victims was soon forgotten, and the myth was preserved.

This appears to be the case with the Chicago Seven. The demonstrators have gotten their placards out and marched and marched and marched, and many people have written emotional letters to the New York Times. But to quote Pete Hamill "if we do nothing more than sign ads in the Times and talk loudly on WRAI, then some hard midnight the bullies will almost certainly come looking for the rest of us." We are all in the frying pan with Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin, and the flames are getting higher.

\*\*\*\*\*

"You have not made a revolution. You have merely exchanged one set of rulers for another."

-Michael Bakunin, letter to Lenin

**POLLUTION: POLITICIAN'S POISON**  
by Ralph Fucetola III

**FUCK THE STATE!**

Lake Baikal in Siberia and Lake Erie in North America have two conditions in common: both are badly polluted and both lakes are under the jurisdiction of States with totalitarian economic systems. With the triumph of state-socialism and state-capitalism throughout the world, mankind is rapidly approaching the day when either mass starvation or mass poisoning will decimate the species.

Men survive by applying reason and labor to raw materials found in nature. Industrialism is the highly organized result of this human ability. Without industrialization, the Earth could only support a population of a few hundred million--and those in conditions similar to life in Europe in the Middle Ages or in much of the Third World today.

Unfortunately, the Earth has a limited capacity to decompose and recirculate the wastes of men's production. We seem to have passed the limit of unaided nature and are poisoning the world. The question is: how to turn technology toward solving the pollution crisis without a foolish attempt to abandon or limit industrialization--an attempt which would lead to extinction for most of mankind.

The question is essentially ECONOMIC, the cause (and most solutions offered so far) are entirely POLITICAL. There are only two ways of obtaining anything of value: the economic method of production and trade or the coercive method of political force.

Clean air and water are valuable commodities. The cost of preventing pollution is, rightfully, a cost of production. At present, this cost is not being paid for by producers and consumers of polluting goods. In our nationalized economy, political force has coerced all of us into "paying" for cheaper goods with our health.

Political force is used in many ways: Con Edison and other state-imposed monopolies are nearly immune from suit by polluted people; the use of chemicals (like DDT) are, at first forced by law, then forbidden by it; "the right" to rape forests of their trees is granted to political cronies; municipalities dump raw sewage--shit, to be exact--into rivers; municipal incinerators pollute the air. Conclusively, the political mechanism is largely to blame.

It would be a serious mistake to trust the political hacks to solve this crisis; they will merely grasp more POWER. Further nationalization of our economy is no way to solve the problems caused by nationalization! The libertarian solution is to establish the supremacy of individual rights. If anyone pollutes the water that flows over a riverbed that I own, or air that passes over my home, I must have the right to bring him to justice. Of course, this solution entails smashing the entire state system FIRST.

In the meantime, we must ORGANIZE around the protection of our own lives, rejecting the politicians and their lies. Using the tactics of mass boycott and mass action, we must make the state and its corporations cease destroying our environment WITHOUT raising taxes or increasing their power over our lives. We must begin to organize to take back the control over our own lives.

**LAISSEZ-FAIRE**

Libertarian-Anarchist Book Service  
GPO Box 2487 NYC 10001

(price list mailed on request)

Publishing Staff: John Brotschol  
Ken Brown  
Ralph Fucetola

OJUKWU vs. GOWAN  
The prize: Biafra  
by John Brotschol

Contributors: Walter Block, Greg  
Kaye, Bob Behrens

The Abolitionist is published  
monthly and subscription rates  
are two fiats (\$2) per year.  
Letters to this newspaper are  
welcomed and will be published.

The Nigerian Civil War has at last ended after 31 months of fighting, in which the control of the Ibo people was at stake, along with the area's natural resources. The war's origins go back to 1966, when the educated and prosperous Ibo elite attempted and succeeded in a coup d'etat against the Nigerian government. General Ironsi, who headed the insurgents, wanted to centralize government and undertake national planning. To insure the success of his program, he murdered the ousted government officials, who were mostly Fulani and Hausa tribesmen. Political infighting between Ironsi and younger Ibo officials, however, weakened the regime, and six months later the government fell to a Hausa group which included General Gowon, a Northerner from a minority tribe. They then proceeded to kill Ironsi and hundreds of Ibo officials. In the Northern region, dominated by Moslems, the counter-coup's success allowed the Hausas to murder thousands of Christian Ibos. It must be pointed out, however, that political and economic reasons were the primary factors, as the Ibos lived substantially better than any other tribe.

When Gowon's government allowed these killings to continue against a people that his regime was supposed to protect, the Ibos began to flee back to their native Eastern region. General Ojukwu, who was military commander in the East under Ironsi, seeing this situation develop, seized upon it and, with the support of other Ibo military officials, seceded from the Nigerian "REpublic" and formed Biafra. The war lasted longer than expected, but the outcome was never in doubt, as Gowon's federal troops pushed the Biafran army back with superior weapons and a well-fed army. The Biafrans fought gallantly against an opponent whose advances resembled Sherman's march to the sea. But the odds were too great, and Biafra fell.

As Gowon and Ojukwu played a game of Risk for Biafra, the Ibo civilians were the real losers due to starvation. All food Biafra received went to the army and government officials, while children starved to death in the streets. Even in the final days of the war reporters pointed out the difference in the living standards of the Biafrans from their leaders. Apparently, both power structures were using their respective tribes for their own benefit and forcing them to make great sacrifices for their masters.

Another group which must share in the responsibility for the Biafran tragedy are the nations who supplied both sides with arms; the French who aided the Biafran army hoping to cash in on the oil deposits; the Portuguese who wanted to weaken Nigeria so it could not aid the Black National movements in Angola and Mozambique; the  
(continued on the next page)

\*\*\*\*\*

"Liberal programs have, without exception, strengthened government and have rejected by their very actions one particular approach to problem-solving; the liberation of people from political control rather than simply trying to advantage them by political favoritism." ---Karl Hess, The Lawless State

(continued from previous page)

Soviet Union, England, and indirectly the United States government, which wanted to gain or maintain influence over Nigeria and the areas natural resources.

What the Nigerian Civil War proved, once and for all, is that man no longer runs government, but government runs man. How then, do Nigeria's political hacks have the right to wage a war of genocide against a people who have withdrawn their sanction from that state? And how do Ojukwu's pigs have the right to starve the people that they are supposed to protect? And why do industrialized nations play their game of death for Biafra's raw materials? Two million people are dead as a result of these governments. When will people realize that the state's growth in power and wealth depends on war, and reject the hacks who run it?

\*\*\*\*\*

### THE TRUE CHAMPION

by Ken Brown

In watching the Ellis-Frazier fight, I could not help but think of the days when Mohammed Ali was fighting. Then, the action in the boxing ring consisted of more than just two men beating each other's brains out. Ali brought something into the ring that Ellis and Frazier never will have- the style and class of a true champion.

Few athletes have this uncanny ability-Pete Maravich is another who does- to dominate their particular sport and at the same time provide the fans with interest and excitement. Whether it was taunting Sonny Liston, demonstrating his "Ali shuffle", or arranging a fight with Wilt Chamberlain, Ali displayed his remarkable ability to dominate his sport and at the same time entertain the fans. And that is what the world of sports is all about.

It is tragic that Ali must not box again because of the determination of this man that his body will not be used by the state as a tool of oppression. Yet this may serve as an excellent example, showing that no one is safe from the greedy claws of the state.

\*\*\*\*\*

"If a country has to draft men to defend it, then there is nothing to defend." ---James Simon Kunen, The Strawberry Statement

-4-

The Abolitionist  
2810 Spruce Street  
Union, New Jersey  
07083